



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0488NJ-1 for Hammonton Public Schools

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant describes a clear vision that all students can learn and it is up to the professional staff to provide appropriate opportunities necessary for students' growth. The key to students' success is for the learning environment to be equipped with learning experiences and collaboration; instructional materials that is high quality; and appropriate technology resources to support teacher and student learning and effective analysis for student achievement. The approach consists of creating learning environments that improve learning and teaching by personalizing strategies, tools and support for all students and teachers. This method will enhance students' opportunities, advancement, and achievement in academic and career.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	4
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides a plan to select the schools that meet the competition's eligibility requirements with a commitment to Absolute Priority 1 for this project. The method consists of reviewing data and selecting four of their own schools to participate with an overall poverty rate showing 43%.</p> <p>WEAKNESSES:</p> <p>The applicant does not provide clear information towards their rationale of selecting the schools. There is a need for further demographics of the selection process in implementing the personalized learning program.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	5
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant describes a plan on how the reform proposal will be scaled up and translates into meaningful reform that will support the district change beyond the participating school. The plan consists of engaging all educators in the process of professional learning communities; in a laser-like focus on students' achievement; and solve problems on all grade levels and content areas. The proposal will improve all student learning outcomes through a five step data team process such as training and guiding activities to collect and chart data; identify strengths and obstacles; set goals, select instructional strategies; and create results indicators, which enhance a common benchmark assessments to support students' advancement.</p> <p>WEAKNESSES:</p> <p>The applicant does not adequately describe a plan that makes clear how it will scale-up their proposed project in a way that ensures it will reach its outcome goals. Therefore it is difficult to assess if their plan adequately addresses all aspects of this criterion.</p>		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	5
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides a plan to improve student learning, performance, and increase equity for the proposed project. For example, providing professional training once a month and five full days in the summer will provide the teachers with the tools</p>		

to support students in learning and teaching which will close the achievement gaps. Students will be able to read on the appropriate grade level and teachers will be able to address all students' needs. The goal is 100% high effective teachers and principals for 2015 -2016 increasing to 15 professional learning days added to professional development training, and all professional staff including paraprofessionals are all responsible parties to support student's advancement.

WEAKNESSES:

The applicant lacks clear information on proficiency status and growth of the students, graduation rates, and college enrollment rates. The proposal shows that a decrease of student proficiency in reading and math declining each funding year goals. For example, the overall subgroup proficiency status as: reading baseline is 96% and 90% SY2012-13 through SY2016-17. Performance on summative assessments result is not ambitious and has already been achieved.

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	9
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant describes some success in its efforts to support student learning and achievement in a personalized learning environment. Hammonton student proficiency rates over the last three years fell below the State average. For example, Math –Spring 2012 comparison to District Factor Group (DFG) and State proficiency scores were as follow: District 77.2%, DFG 68.5% and 79.3% State; Language Art Literacy- District 89.2%, DFG 86.9% and 91.53% State.</p> <p>Hammonton High School was selected out of 33 schools to participate in a pilot study sponsored by the New Jersey Department of Education in collaboration with the Educational Information and Resource Center and received a letter for their commitment to the core principles of a professional learning community to promote school improvement.</p> <p>October 9, 2012, Hammonton High School met performance goals and all progress target, and participation rate goals of 90%.</p> <p>WEAKNESSES:</p> <p>While the applicant shared its data and there is some growth, the performance is below that of the state average and does not really evidence success.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	0
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>WEAKNESSES:</p> <p>The applicant does not provide highly transparent financial information to District processes, practices, and investments which shows the requirements for eligibility to receive a Race to the Top- District grant. For example, the annual budget and comprehensive annual financial report are available to the public on the Town of Hammonton in the County of Atlantic, NJ School District website, NJ Department of Education website, and the US Census Bureau's website which makes it difficult to ascertain if all of the required data are posted and to be able to view this data easily.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant reports on how successful conditions under State legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements helps support student's advancement through implementing a personalized learning environments in this proposed project. For example, the Hammonton School District is under the state monitoring system, which allows full autonomy to implement the learning environment through the Professional Learning Communities process. This process consists of highly trained faculty, funds, supervisors, and space to make all the necessary improvements and adjustments to implement the personalized learning environment.</p>		

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	0
(B)(4) Reviewer Comments: WEAKNESSES: <p>The applicant does not provides no evidence that an adequate number of teachers support this proposal.</p>		
(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	2
(B)(5) Reviewer Comments: <p>The applicant identifies a plan for identifying needs and gaps after they begin implementing a personalized learning environment to support student's advancement. This plan consists of placing a professional development and technology professional learning committee in each building; meetings throughout the school year to evaluate all professional plans; and collect appropriate data as evidence to evaluate all professional plans, and set goals.</p> WEAKNESSES: <p>However, the criterion asks the applicant to analyze the current status of implementing personalied lerning environments and this is not at all addressed.</p>		

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	0
(C)(1) Reviewer Comments: WEAKNESSES: <p>The applicant does not demonstrate evidence of a high-quality plan to improve learning and teaching in a personalized learning environment. For example, the applicant did not sufficiently or coherently address how teachers would help students understand what they are learning is the key to their success, nor do they sufficiently describe how each student will have access to a personalized sequence of instructional content, nor is there adequate detail of how they will align instruction to college-and career ready standards, goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties to support student's advancement. The proposal does not clearly present a plan to show how the students will be supported by both parents and educators as the various proposed strategies are implemented.</p>		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	7
(C)(2) Reviewer Comments: <p>The applicant describes limited detail of a plan to improve the learning for participants in this project. The applicant describes a professional evaluation to improve high-effective teaching and a rubric to collect data and support participants in the engagement of direct instructionals for all stakeholders to accelerate students' achievement.</p> WEAKNESSES: <p>The applicant does not describe a high-quality plan for improving learning and teaching in a personalized learning environment to support the students' advancement. The narrative lacks an approach or strategies engaging for training individual teachers or for providing professional teams or communities to support teachers' individual and collective capacity to carry out the project. It is very difficult to assess if all participants will have access to and know how to use tools data, and resources to accelerate student progress toward meeting college- and career- ready graduation requirements. This applicants response does not meet the eligibility requirements of this criterion.</p>		

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	10
(D)(1) Reviewer Comments: The applicant describes the program plan on practices, policies, and rules to support project implementation. This plan consists of an Organizational chart for communicating, allowing engagement in the process that facilitates personalized training, promotes school leadership teams, and provides structure for problem-solving and decision making. For example, three stages of Understanding by Design process Curriculum design allowing stakeholders to work on every summer with the development and refinement. The outcomes of this process will provide students with the opportunities to progress and demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times in comparable ways where throughout the district every grade level will develop common benchmark assessment. Professional training allowed will enhance stakeholders' capability of effectively facilitating personalized learning to accelerate student's growth. WEAKNESSES: The applicant does not provide information on how the program will provide learning resources and instructional practices adaptable and fully accessible to all students in this project. It is difficult to fully assess the eligibility requirements for this criterion.		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	0
(D)(2) Reviewer Comments: WEAKNESSES: The applicant does not a detailed, thorough plan to improve personalized learning environment to support students' advancement. The narrative lacks information on goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties. The plan does not show how school infrastructure, using information technology systems, and interoperable data will supports this project to ensure all participants will have the necessary content, tools, and other learning resources for in and out of school to support the implementation of the individualized learning program.		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	15
(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: The applicant describes their plan for implementing a rigorous continuous improvement process to provide timely and regular feedback throughout the duration of the project. For example, each month during the one full professional learning day will allow teachers and support staff to engage in analysis of student achievement on common benchmark assessments which is aligned with a rigorous curriculum. Ongoing monitoring will take place through the use of teacher, principal and superintendent evaluation system. The State assessment system and district will monitor the students' progress and whether or not it is aligned with college- and career-ready standards. The process will allow for an effective improvement process from significant increase in professional learning time to support students' advancement in this program.		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	5
(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: The applicant describes a reasonable plan for ongoing communication and engagement to improve student's personalized learning project. The approach consists of laser focus on student achievement, clear curriculum choices, priority and unwrapping standards, formative assessments, and multiple opportunities for success. The concept will be shared during outreach meetings, parent meetings, and other stakeholders internal and external to support the acceleration of students' achievement.		

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	0
(E)(3) Reviewer Comments: WEAKNESSES: The applicant does not provide the required elements for this criterion. For example, a rationale measures, how the performance measures will provide rigorous, timely, and formative leading information tailored to the project, and how the performance measures will be review and improved over time are not adequately covered.		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	0
(E)(4) Reviewer Comments: WEAKNESSES: The application lacks information on how the program will evaluate the funded activities that employs technology. The narrative lacks information on the productive use of time, staff, money, and other resources to improve the results of service delivery.		

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	5
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: The applicant provides a budget and budget narrative identifying funds use to support activities to improve student's personalized learning project. The plan consists of elements required by the Race to the Top-District grant such as personnel, fringe benefits, and contractual. The project budget would serve 3,600 students and 300 professional staff members in a Choice District with 4 locations for a four-year project. WEAKNESSES: The applicant does not clearly justify the line item of funds from other sources of \$151,613.00 used to support the project in this narrative. For example the budge narrative total \$840,000 for contractual services and budget table reports \$210,000.00 which is unclear. Therefore, it was difficult to fully assess if the budget is reasonable and cost efficient.		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	0
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: WEAKNESSES: The applicant does not provide clear information on a high-quality plan for ensuring sustainability of the project goals after the term of this grant. Without further information on budget assumptions, potential sources, and uses of funds, it is difficult to fully assess if this project meets the eligibility requirements for this criterion.		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	10
Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments: The applicant provides information on the coherent and sustainable partnership formed to support the plan. The partnership will track the selected indicators that measure each result at the aggregate level for all students participating in this program. For example, in place to scale the model beyond the participating students to at least other high-need students and communities, integrate education and other services, building capacity of staff, identify inventory needs and assets, engage parents and families, maximize impact and resolve challenges, identify achievable performance measures; and strategies will improve results over time to support students' achievement. The plan in this proposal will support student's growth.		

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Not Met
Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments: WEAKNESSES: The applicant does not meet the Absolute Priority 1 for this project. This project lacks the four core education assurance needed to meet the eligibility requirements for the Race to the Top-District grant. For example, the proposal does not provide how the program will improve the learning environment to support students through the personalization strategies required by the grant.		

Total	210	97
-------	-----	----

Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)

	Available	Score
Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)	15	0
Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments: The applicant does not address this criterion for this budget.		



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0488NJ-2 for Hammonton Public Schools

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	6
(A)(1) Reviewer Comments: (A) Hammonton Public Schools did not provide a comprehensive and coherent reform vision that builds on the four educational assurances. The district did not provide a clear understanding of how the professional development would translate into college and career-readiness skills and knowledge for students.gh professional development is the emphasis of this project, the district did not address how the district would as a result of this training reward, retain, and recruit high-effective teachers and administrators. The district has proposed a reasonable plan to provide professional development to all teachers and principals in order to become high-effective by 2015-16. It is reasonable for the district to add an additional fifteen days of professional learning throughout the school year for four years of the grant. The district has plans to provide focus on student achievement by allowing all teachers to develop lessons based on the Common Core, learn techniques to individualize instructions, and use formative assessments. The district has a plan to have 100% of teachers and principals,		

Prek-12 rated highly effective.

This criterion will be rated Middle.

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10
---	----	----

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

(a) Hammonton Public Schools has a clear process for selecting participating schools. The project goal involves 100% participation of teachers and principals in all district schools. All four schools will be served in the district, representing an estimated 3,604 students and 352 educators in grades Prek-12. The district serves a student population that is 43% low-income.

(b/c) Hammonton Public Schools has provided a complete list of schools participating in professional development project.

The district has provided an adequate approach to implementing its professional development plan to support high-quality district- and school-level implementation.

This criterion will be rated a High..

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	6
---	----	---

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Hammonton Public Schools has provided a plan with information not addressed. The plan has provided a the plan to support district-wide change by engaging all members in professional learning communities with a focus on student achievement. Data teams will be developed at each grade level with a five-step process to guide training and team work.

The plan does not describe how the professional development will be scaled-up and transformed into meaning reform that will support the district into reaching its goal.

This criterion will be rated -middle.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	3
---	----	---

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

(a)Hammonton Public Schools annual goals are not ambitious yet achievable for performance on summative assessments. The baseline percent proficient is greater than the 2016-17 percent proficient. This goal is not be achievable if baseline data is higher.The plan does not provide a narrative with further details.

(b) Hammonton Public Schools has not provided data or information trend in on decreasing the achievement gap. The appropriate charts were not attached as stated in the proposal.

(c) Hammonton Public Schools provided incomplete data on graduation rates. All subgroups are not included. The graduation rate for White students is not included.

(d) Hammonton Public Schools provided incomplete data on graduation rates. All subgroups are not included. The college enrollment rate for White students is not included

The district has not provided information to determine if the district's vision will result in improved student learning and performance and increased equity as demonstrated by ambitious yet achievable goals.

This criterion will be rated low

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	9

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

(a)Hammonton Public Schools has not provided charts or graphs as evidence of achievement gains. The district has not demonstrated improved student learning outcomes or evidence of closing achievement gaps. The district has undergone a five year restructuring process as part of ESEA to raise student achievement and increase equity in learning undergone restructuring process as part of ESEA.

(b)Hammonton Public School did not provide clear evidence in the form of graphs and charts to determine if the district has achieved ambitious and significant reforms in low-achieving schools. The Hammonton high school has met the ESEA waiver annual target performance goals of 90% and all progress targets and participation rate goals; however; no evidence was provided.

(c)Hammonton Public Schools provides a clear plan for disseminating student performance data to students, parents and educators to help improve participation, instruction, and services by placing information on the website and school television channel. The district provides information at various meetings: Board Meetings, School Advisory Committees, School Instructional Management Teams, and Bilingual Parent Advisory Council meetings.

The district has not provided the appropriate evidence as stated above to adequately address each criterion.

This criterion will be rated Middle.

(a)Hammonton Public Schools has not provided charts or graphs as evidence of achievement gains. The district has not demonstrated improved student learning outcomes or evidence of closing achievement gaps. The district has undergone a five year restructuring process as part of ESEA to raise student achievement and increase equity in learning undergone restructuring process as part of ESEA.

(b)Hammonton Public School did not provide clear evidence in the form of graphs and charts to determine if the district has achieved ambitious and significant reforms in low-achieving schools. The Hammonton high school has met the ESEA waiver annual target performance goals of 90% and all progress targets and participation rate goals; however; no evidence was provided.

(c)Hammonton Public Schools provides a clear plan for disseminating student performance data to students, parents and

educators to help improve participation, instruction, and services by placing information on the website and school television channel. The district provides information at various meetings: Board Meetings, School Advisory Committees, School Instructional Management Teams, and Bilingual Parent Advisory Council meetings.

The district has not provided the appropriate evidence as stated above to adequately address each criterion.

This criterion will be rated Middle.

(a)Hammonton Public Schools has not provided charts or graphs as evidence of achievement gains. The district has not demonstrated improved student learning outcomes or evidence of closing achievement gaps. The district has undergone a five year restructuring process as part of ESEA to raise student achievement and increase equity in learning undergone restructuring process as part of ESEA.

(b)Hammonton Public School did not provide clear evidence in the form of graphs and charts to determine if the district has achieved ambitious and significant reforms in low-achieving schools. The Hammonton high school has met the ESEA waiver annual target performance goals of 90% and all progress targets and participation rate goals; however; no evidence was provided.

(c)Hammonton Public Schools provides a clear plan for disseminating student performance data to students, parents and educators to help improve participation, instruction, and services by placing information on the website and school television channel. The district provides information at various meetings: Board Meetings, School Advisory Committees, School Instructional Management Teams, and Bilingual Parent Advisory Council meetings.

The district has not provided the appropriate evidence as stated above to adequately address each criterion.

This criterion will be rated Middle.

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	1
--	---	---

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Hammonton Public Schools provide limited information to determine if the district provides a hi-level of transparency in the processes, practices, and investments, including making public school level expenditures. The district's Annual Budget and Comprehensive Annual Financial Report are located on the websites for the Town of Hammonton, County of Atlantic; NJ School District; NJ Department of Education; and the US Census Bureau's.

The district did not provide details to ensure a high level of transparency that it makes available school salaries and non-personnel expenditures at the building level. The district did not provide narrative information regarding the nature of the reports listed.

This criterion will be rated low.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	10
---	----	----

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Hammonton Public Schools has not provided sufficient information on successful conditions and autonomy under state legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements. Information provided included the district is not under state monitoring, has received no financial audit exceptions after a number of audits, and employs adequate supervisors in content areas at the district level to implement the professional development program.

Details on the district's organizational structure or management plan was not adequately addressed and demonstrated evidence of successful conditions and sufficient autonomy under State, legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements was not provided..

This criterion will be rated low.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	5
---	----	---

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

(a) Hammonton Public Schools has demonstrated clear evidence of meaningful stakeholder engagement with the collective bargaining representative. The union president signed the grant application. The district held meetings with the Town of Hammonton; Hammonton Public Schools, Administrators, Supervisors, Teachers and Support staff, Home and School Association; and the Education Foundation; and Bilingual Parent Advisory. The name and signature of the local board president was included on the signature page of the grant.

(b) Hammonton Public Schools district did not provide letters of support for key stake-holder groups as listed in the plan. Only two letters were included.

The district did not provide adequate documentation in the form of letters of support from key stakeholders and partnerships stating support of the grant.

This criterion will receive a Middle rating.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	1
--	---	---

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

Hammonton Public Schools has not provided evidence of a high quality plan for the analysis of the district's current status in implementing personalizes learning environments and any pertinent logic behind the reform proposal. The district has not clearly addressed any identified needs and gaps that the plan will address. The goal of the proposal is to have 100% of the teachers and administrators highly-effective by 2015-16, but does not provide a rationale. The district provided a list of one-day monthly professional development session, but did not provide details of how these topics would address a specific need and close the achievement gap.

The district did not describe a cohesive plan based on evidence or gaps that the proposed a will address.

This criterion will be rated Low.

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	4

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

(a)

(i)The Hammonton District has not address how with the support of parents and educators, students will understand what they are learning is key to their success in accomplishing their goals. Although the proposal addresses the district implemented a rigorous curriculum by utilizing the Understanding by Design to design curriculum for Prek-12, it does provide and details of how this will benefit students. The district's curriculum is aligned with the New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards, the Common Core State Standards in language arts and mathematics, and New Jersey's Standards, Technology, and Standards, and 21st Century Life and Career Skills. The district has stated that 5th grade blended-learning lesson plans were developed by interested teachers; documents were not attached.

(ii)Hammonton Public Schools has reasonably addressed how students will identify and developed goals liked to college and career-readiness standards. Hammonton High School has implemented web-based program, My Road developed by the College Board. Students are able to develop a comprehensive and personalized college and career planning tool for high school students coordinated with guidance counselors and health/physical education teachers. In additions, all teachers have received training on the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) with goals linked to college- and career-readiness standards for English language learners. The SIOP is included in the teacher observation process.

(iii)Hammonton Public Schools has developed a plan for frequently measuring student progress through the professional learning process Data Teams. These teams will captures data and immediately adjust instructional strategies to meet students' needs. Data Team review grade level results and through weekly meeting determines appropriate instructional strategies.

(iv) Hammonton Public Schools did not address providing access and exposure to diverse culture, contents and exposures.

(v) Hammonton Public Schools has not addressed how students with the support of parents and educators will master critical academic content and develop skills and traits such as goal-setting teamwork, perseverance, critical thinking, communication, creativity, and problem-solving. The district stated grades K-5 would be implementing the 90/90/90 Schools Leadership and Learning Center and proving training for Data Teams on the effective use of a data-driven process, uses formative assessments, and maintains a focus on teaching and learning; however there was no link to student outcomes in this criterion.

(b)

(i) Hammonton Public Schools has not presented a plan for how each student will have access to a personalized sequence of instructional content and skill that would enable students to achieve their college and career-ready. This criterion was not address by the district.

(ii) Hammonton Public Schools' proposal has not described high-quality content instructional approaches and environments.

(iii) Hammonton Public Schools' proposal did not provide clear evidence of evidence high-quality content that includes digital learning contents aligned to college and career-ready standards and graduation. The district did not describe any high-quality content or digital learning content currently being used on any grade level or subject aligned with college and career-ready standards currently being used by the district.

(iv) Hammonton Public Schools did not describe sound on-going and regular feedback to frequently update student data and provide students with personalized learning recommendations.

(v) Hammonton Public Schools proposal did not provide clear details addressing the provision of accommodations and high-quality strategies for all students with high-needs to ensure they are on track for achieving career-and college readiness goals. The plan did address providing high quality strategies for English language learners through the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) with goals linked to college- and career-readiness standards for English language learners. The SIOP is included in the teacher observation process.

(c) Hammonton Public Schools proposal did not clearly describe the mechanisms in place for to provide training and support to students that will ensure they understand how to use tools and resources provided to them in order to track and manage their learning

The district did not provide a high-quality proposal improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the supports to graduate college and career-ready.

This criterion will be rated Low.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)

20

12

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

(a)

(i.) Hammonton Public Schools have not adequately described a plan to support the effective implementation of personalized learning environments and strategies that meet the each students' academic needs and help ensure all students graduate on time and are college and career-ready. Professional development topics were listed in the plan but the district failed to provide linkage to outcomes for all students.

(ii) Hammonton Public Schools has not described a plan to adapt content and instruction, allowing students to engage in common and individual tasks in response to the students' academic needs and interest. The district provides tutoring for students reading below grade level in reading in Title I School; however, the details were not provided on how instruction was on adapting content and instructions or allowing students to engage in common and individual tasks in response to the their academic needs and interest.

(iii) Hammonton Public Schools has not provided a plan to frequently measure student progress toward meeting college and career-readiness standards and graduation. The plan does not address the use of data to inform both the acceleration of student progress and the improvement of the individual student and collective practices of educators. The district has implemented a comprehensive and personalized college and career planning web-based program coordinated with guidance counselors and health/physical education teachers. The district is also providing training for Data Teams in elementary schools

(iv) Hammonton Public Schools has provided a clear process to improve teachers' practice and effectiveness through frequent feedback on individual and collective effectiveness and provide recommendations, supports and interventions when needed. The district's Professional Practice Evaluation Committee the district developed an improved teacher observation tool based on the research of Charlotte Danielson. Observers note areas of strength, areas of growth, and areas of concern. The Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) with goals linked to college- and career-readiness standards for English language learners. The SIOP

is included in the teacher observation process in included in the teacher walkthrough process for all teachers. The plan did not address how principals would be evaluated.

(b)

(i) Hammonton Public Schools has not provided reasonable details on actionable information that helps educators identify optimal learning approaches that respond to the individual needs of the student academic needs. The address the use of data teams at the elementary level, but did not provide how the teams would use the data.

(ii) Hammonton Public Schools has not presented in the proposal a plan to address high-quality learning resources including digital resources aligned with college and career-ready graduation requirements and the tools to create and share new resources.

(iii) Hammonton Public Schools has not described the process and tools that will be used to match student need with specific resources and approaches. The district will participate in training designed to create highly-effective teachers and principals that emphasize; however there is no correlation with creating learning environments to improve learning and teaching through personalization of tools, strategies, and supports for both students and teachers.

(c)

(i) The district has developed a reasonable plan for the teacher evaluation system. The district utilizes the teacher walk-through and teacher observation process. Teachers and administrators receive training on the walk-through instrument. The district does provide a plan to address continuous improvement through the evaluation system on the steps to improve individual and collective educator effectiveness and school culture and climate.

(ii) The district has not described the process and tools that will be used to match student needs with specific resources and approaches for all subgroups. In the limited data provided by the district, the Hispanic student subgroup is the only minority group other than student with limited English proficiency. The district has not provided a plan to close the achievement gap for subgroups in accordance with the grant. The Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) with goals linked to college- and career-readiness standards for English language learners. The SIOP is included in the teacher observation process in included in the teacher walkthrough process for all teachers.

(d) The district has provided a clear plan for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from highly effective teachers and principals through training and professional learning communities organized through the plan.

The district's plan did not adequately address how the district would use data to inform both the acceleration of student progress and the improvement of the individual and collective practices of educators. The plan did not address providing individual and collective effectiveness by providing recommendations, support, and interventions as needed to teachers through the evaluation process.

This criterion will be rated Middle

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	7
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>.</p> <p>a. Hammonton Public Schools does not provide a reasonable plan for organizing the district office governance structure to provide support and services to all schools. The district provided a chart of the Professional Learning Communities as a means of communication that allows staff a process for facilitating personalized learning for staff.</p> <p>(b) Hammonton Public Schools has not described any evidence of school of school teams allowing flexibility and autonomy for school leadership teams. The district did not address school teams having decision-making ability over factors such as the school schedule, school personnel decisions, budget, and roles and responsibilities</p> <p>(c) Hammonton Public Schools' professional development proposal has not provided details on providing opportunities for students to gain credit based on demonstrated mastery, rather than time on task.</p> <p>(d)Hammonton Public Schools' professional development proposal has provided details on providing opportunities for students to gain mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple ways. The district provided professional development training for teachers to develop and refine instructional methods that provided students mastery of standard at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways</p> <p>(e) Hammonton Public Schools' professional has not clearly addressed the provision of learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable and fully accessible to all students, including students with disabilities. The district uses the walk-through process to plan appropriate strategies to meet the needs of all students.</p> <p>The district did not present a high-quality plan with clear information to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure with adequate support and resources they needed when and where they are needed. The district did not address the required issues in this criterion.</p> <p>This criterion is rated Middle.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	0
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(a) Hammonton Public Schools' professional develop plan does not evidence of ensuring how all students, parent and educators, regardless of income would have access to necessary content, tools and learning resources in and out of school.</p> <p>(b) Hammonton Public Schools' plan lacked sufficient information on providing appropriate technical support to students, parent, and educators.</p>		

(c) Hammonton Public Schools' professional development plan does not address using information technology to export information in an open format and use data in other electronic learning systems.

(d) Hammonton Public Schools' professional development plan lacked reasonable information on the district and school using interoperable data system.

The district does not provide clear information on the district and school infrastructure to support students personalized learning.

This criterion is rated low-Low.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	15
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Hammonton Public Schools has effectively described a strategy for implementing a rigorous continuous improvement process. Monthly professional days will be utilized to analyze student achievement on common benchmarks aligned to the rigorous curriculum and develop and monitor students' personalized learning. Summer institutes will provide opportunities for curriculum revision.</p> <p>The district's plan provides a clear and high-quality approach to continuously improve its' plan for professional development.</p> <p>This criterion is rated High</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	5
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The district provided reasonable strategies for ongoing communications and engagement through the refined professional learning communities' process. The District will communicate strategies and practices within organizations, parents, and the community through outreach meetings, articulation with receiving districts, and at all parent meetings.</p> <p>The district provided a clear plan of communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders.</p> <p>This criterion is rated High.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	0
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>a. Hammonton Public Schools provided an unclear rationale for selecting the measure. The district provided obscure information in the performance measures template and does not demonstrate student achievement. The district does not present all subgroups' data for those grades that are required to have it included.</p>		

- b. Hammonton Public Schools has not provided insufficient performance measures and will not provide a rigorous, timely and formative information regarding district's ability to successfully implement the proposal and with regard to the areas of concern.
- c. Hammonton Public Schools' plan does not provide a clear plan for the review and improvement of the measures over time if it is insufficient to gauge over time. The district will provide intense monitoring of student achievement and monitor through the teacher and principal evaluation process.

The district did not provide ambitious and achievable performances.

This criterion is rated Low

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	0
---	---	---

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Hammonton Public School's plan lacks a comprehensive plan to evaluate the effectiveness of the proposed activities and to more productively use time, staff, money, and other resources in order to improve results. The district did not describe a formal research evaluation method. The district's plan to only use teacher and principal evaluations and student achievement is not sufficient to meet this criteria. The district did not address how results from an ongoing evaluation process would be used for continues improvement of the program and to implement any required adjustments.

The district's plan lack sufficient evidence to effectively evaluate the all activities of the grant.

This criterion will be rated low-Low.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	6

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

(a)Hammonton Public School has reasonably identified all funds that will support the professional development plan. The budget has identified Race to the Top-District funds and funds from other sources used to support the project in Table 1-1. The other funds were not identified as district, state, or other federal funds. Table 2-1 was not properly completed.

(b)The district has provided a reasonable and sufficient budget to support the development and implement of the professional development plan.

(c)

- i. The district provided a reasonable description and the amount of funds with a rationale.
- ii. The district has effectively identified funds as reoccurring. Funds for the pension and FICA for 164 staff members have been identified as one-time expenditures.

The district does not provide a narrative to describe specific details in the budget and all required tables completed completed..

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)

10

10

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Hammonton Public School's proposed professional development has a high-quality plan for sustaining the project's goals after the grant ends. The district will develop principal and teacher leaders to train new staff. The district will assume the annual cost of software for students and the principal/teacher evaluation software.

The district has provided evidence of sustainability.

This criterion will be rated High.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	6

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

1. The Competitive Preference Priority presented by the Hammonton Public Schools includes a clear description of a coherent and sustainable partnership with the Atlanticare Behavioral Health Services for providing an afterschool program.
2. The district has clearly identified three groups: English language learners, economically disadvantaged, and students with disabilities. The desired results are aligned with the professional development plan to increase student achievement and improve student attendance.
3. The district has described on how the partnership would track the selected indicators, use data to target its resources, and the strategy to scale-up the model beyond the participating students. Students who are English language learners enrolled in the program will be assessed. Details for tracking students with disabilities and economically disadvantaged was not provided. A clear strategy for scaling-up was not provided.
4. The district has reasonably demonstrated how the partnership will integrate education and other services into the program through the partnership. The afterschool program will offer homework assistance, daily snacks, social networking, and field trips.
5. The district does not address how the partnership or district would build capacity of staff in participating schools. District staff is employed by the program.
6. The district has established ambitious yet achievable performance measures for the proposed population and described desired results for students.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not	Met

	Met	
<p>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Hammonton Public Schools has proposed a plan that is insufficient to provide professional development to have all teachers and principals in order to become high-effective by 2015-16. The plan did not adequately address the reform vision based on the four educational assurance areas. The district did not articulate a clear and credible approach as to how the professional development would improve learning and teaching, through personalized learning strategies, tools, and supports form other students and educators. The plan does not address student's participation in rigorous curriculum and the mastery of content such as the Common Core Curriculum and the College and Career-Ready Standards.</p>		
Total	210	116



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0488NJ-3 for Hammonton Public Schools

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	2
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant fails to satisfy this criterion.</p> <p>Applicant fails to set forth a comprehensive and coherent reform vision which builds on its work in four core educational assurance areas as defined in the RTTD notice. Specifically, applicant's vision does not address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adopting standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace and to compete in the global economy; • Building data system that measure student growth and success, and inform teachers and principals with data about how they can improve instruction; • Recruiting, developing rewarding and retaining effective teachers and principals, especially in schools where they are needed most; and • Turning around lowest-achieving schools. <p>While the vision statement reflects basic commitments to the proposition that all students can learn and that all educators are responsible for making this happen there is no compelling narrative which elaborates the fundamental requirement of this criterion to address acceleration of student achievement, deepening of student learning and increased equity through personalized instruction.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	3
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant fails to satisfy this criterion.</p>		

Applicant's reform proposal fundamentally focuses on professional development with 100% of its teachers and principals proposed to participate in a RTTD funded additional fifteen days of training each year (for four years) through a Professional Learning Community (PLC) job-embedded training program. The goal is to ensure that by 2015-2016 100% of the applicant's teachers and principals will be ranked as highly effective. Applicant does not say in response to this criterion how the latter determination will be made. A comprehensive list of stand-alone topics is provided which will be addressed in monthly (PLC) settings. These topics appear to be worthy and many could be considered as relevant to certain RTTD priorities including, for example, meeting the challenges of the common core, use of data teams to inform instructional practice and infusing technology into instructional practice but applicant does not state how these stand-alone training sessions will lead to personalized student learning. Apparently, all district schools will participate in this proposed professional development. Applicant notes that 43% of its total student population is low income. However, NO students are directly involved in the applicant's proposal. Students are inferentially hypothesized to benefit from the proposed professional development. Accordingly, this reviewer believes that the applicant has essentially failed to satisfy both the spirit and the letter of the criterion which explicitly assumes direct student involvement.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	3
---	----	---

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments: Applicant does not adequately satisfy this criterion. Applicant provides chart-formatted displays of its 3-year trends in state assessment as a launching pad for its proposal to support district wide change by engaging all teachers and principals in Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) with what is described as a “laser-like” focus on student achievement. Data teams are proposed to be fully operational in all grade-levels, K-5 and in every content area in grades 6-12. Data teams will collect and chart data, identify strengths and obstacles, set goals, select instructional strategies, and create results indicators. Data teams will also create common benchmark assessments. However, the applicant fails to respond directly to the criterion. There is no mention of how the reform proposal will be scaled up although by definition, since this is a small district and all teachers and principals are involved in the project the issue of scaling becomes moot. More significantly, the applicant does not speak about a theory of change or logic model. The supposition is that if a comprehensive effort is made to improve professional performance then student achievement will result. This is a major and unsubstantiated conclusion. This reviewer also remains concerned that the applicant's responses to criterion (A)(3) remain outside the parameters of RTTD intentions with respect to criteria (A)(1) and (A)(2) and thus is not satisfied.		
--	--	--

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	3
---	----	---

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments: Applicant has failed to adequately satisfy this criterion. Applicant asserts that provision of fifteen additional days each year devoted to staff development through participation in Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) will close its achievement gap. The applicant also emphasizes that its intent is to ensure that all students are reading at grade level by the end of grade 3. Further, Data Teams—as referenced in response to criterion (A)(3)—will meet weekly to target instructional needs which will be communicated to all grade level teachers. Once a month, full-day meetings of the (PLCs) teachers and other professional support staff will focus on how to personalize the learning of every child under their charge. Applicant mentions planned use of the 90/90/90 school improvement process and Designs for Education Problem-Based Learning together with an infusion of technology to motivate both teachers and staff. The applicant has made a major leap to the conclusion that the skill set gained by teachers through intensive professional development will lead to learner-centered or personalized instruction. This conclusion is unsubstantiated. Charts are provided which respond to the four areas of anticipated improvements in student performance identified in the criterion although the data is incomplete—e.g., Decreasing Achievement Gaps. This reviewer remains unpersuaded by applicant's assumptions that gains in student achievement can be correlated with the proposed professional development regardless of how sophisticated the latter may be. The assumptions are speculative and essentially unwarranted without provision of a detailed and professionally credible research design. The applicant does not provide such information. The applicant has failed to satisfy this criterion.		
---	--	--

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score

(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	5
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant fails to fully satisfy this criterion.</p> <p>As evidence of a clear record of success in the past four years in advancing student learning the applicant provides the following evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information related to Determining Achievement Gaps that demonstrate student achievement on state assessments as compared to the District Factor Group (DFG) including results over a three year time period. This information is relevant to the criterion. • ^a A Professional Learning Community (PLC) structure which is embedded within the district's organizational structure. (Not relevant to the criterion.) • Selection of its high school as a participant in the state's PLC laboratory project. (Not relevant to the criterion.) • In 2012 the district's high school met performance goals of 90% and also met all progress target or participation goals. (Not directly relevant to the criterion.) <p>While commendable, the evidence fails to respond adequately to the criterion. It does not cover a four year period. It does not address increased equity in learning and teaching, It does not include graphic evidence of applicant's ability to improve student learning outcomes and close achievement gaps. Nor is evidence provided that speaks of improved high school graduation rates or of "ambitious and significant reforms" related to the district lowest performing school(s). It is noted that the district does provide student performance data to students, educator and parents.</p> <p>Overall, the applicant fails to fully satisfy this criterion.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	2
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant fails to fully satisfy this criterion.</p> <p>Applicant provides the most meagre detail in response to this criterion. It notes that The Annual Budget and Comprehensive Annual Financial Report are available to the public via a local website, New Jersey School District website, New Jersey Department of Education website and the US Census Bureau website. Specific reference to the detailed requirements of the criterion are missing from the application.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	5
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant fails to fully satisfy this criterion.</p> <p>Applicant provides evidence that it possesses the necessary conditions including sufficient autonomy to implement its RTTD proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District is not under state monitoring. • District has skilled professional staff capable of directly assisting in the project implementation. • District is adequately funded. • District supervisory staff is competent to implement personalized learning environments. (This reviewer notes that applicant's proposal is for funding of a major professional development project. Mention is not made about the capacity of the central office staff to implement this project.) • District buildings and grounds are in good condition and capable of accommodating the implementation of personalized learning environments. 		

- Faculty is highly motivated in support of the project.

There appear to be no state legal, statutory and/or regulatory requirements that would prevent implementation of personalized learning environments. The problem for this reviewer is that the applicant has not developed a personalized learning proposal. Again, as noted in relation to (A)(4), the applicant has made a major leap to the conclusion that the skill set gained by teachers through intensive professional development will lead to learner-centered or personalized instruction. This reviewer remains unpersuaded by applicant's assumptions that gains in student achievement can be correlated with the proposed professional development project regardless of how sophisticated the latter may be. The assumptions are speculative and essentially unwarranted without provision of a detailed and professionally credible research design which would allow testing of the underlying but as yet unstated hypothesis. The applicant does not provide such information. The applicant has failed to fully satisfy this criterion.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)

10

5

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has failed to fully satisfy this criterion.

Applicant notes its communication/feedback loop with local mayor relative to the proposal. Other stakeholders were also presented with the proposal including board members, community members, parents, staff and students. Applicant does not indicate how/if students and families were involved in the development of the proposal or to what extent others made substantive contributions except for district staff. Also noted is the district's planned engagement in strategic planning activities related to the project during the 2012-2013 school year—apparently parallel to implementation. All elements of the proposal will undergo more planning and discussion. District also has a professional partnership with Rowan University including the Math-Science Partnership professional learning initiative, the Leadership and Learning Center, Innovative Design for Education, Reading and Language Arts Centers plus the Southern Regional Institute and Educational Technology Training Center. Applicant does not specifically say how the proposal was revised based on specific input from the cited sources. Evidence is provided to confirm at least 70% of the schools affected by the proposal are supportive. Since this is a small district, all teachers are to be involved. A limited number of letters of support are provided for the project. This reviewer notes that the applicant provides a sparsity of information in response to this criterion. It is clear from the RTTD notice that substantial evidence of meaningful stakeholder input was to be provided relative to the development and refinement of the proposal. The information provided is insufficient. Thus the criterion is only partially satisfied.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)

5

0

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant fails to satisfy this criterion

Rather than replying to the criterion which asks for a high quality plan for analysing the applicant's current status in implementing personalized learning environments this part of the criterion is essentially ignored whether on purpose or because the applicant did not understand what was requested. Applicant fails to provide any direct information about the current status of its efforts to implement personalized learning. Applicant did address the issue of needs and gaps but in the context of its proposed RTTD funded professional development. Again, as noted earlier by this reviewer in evaluating previous criteria, the applicant has made a major leap to the conclusion that the skill set gained by teachers through intensive professional development will lead to learner-centered or personalized instruction, acceleration of student achievement, deepening of student learning and increasing equity through personalized instruction grounded in common and individual tasks based on student academic interests. This reviewer remains unpersuaded by the applicant's assumptions that this will occur or that gains in student achievement can be correlated with the proposed professional development regardless of how sophisticated the latter may be. The assumptions are speculative and essentially unwarranted without provision of a detailed and professionally credible research design which would allow testing of the underlying but as yet unstated hypotheses. The applicant never provides such information. The applicant has failed to fully satisfy this criterion.

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score

(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	5
(C)(1) Reviewer Comments: <p>The applicant fails to adequately address this criterion.</p> <p>This criterion is complex, demanding and explicit in terms of the responses expected by the applicant. Instead, the responses which are provided are superficial. They generally contain essentially extraneous information rather than being directly responsive to the criterion. Generalized statements are made about district commitments, innovative programs, authentic learning units or technology infused classroom experiences but the applicant never gets close to pursuit of learning and developmental goals linked to college- and career-ready standards or fostering deep learning experiences, access to diverse cultures or the 21st century learning skills that are identified in the criterion. Neither does the applicant speak about personalized sequences of instructional content and skill development designed to help students achieve their individual learning goals or frequently updated data that can be used to determine progress toward mastery of college- and career-ready standards. This reviewer concludes that the nature of the applicant's putative proposal fails to provide a compelling narrative which elaborates the fundamental requirement of the RTTD notice, viz., to address acceleration of student achievement, deepening of student learning and increasing equity through personalized instruction grounded in common and individual tasks based on student academic interests. The applicant fails to adequately address this criterion.</p>		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	10
(C)(2) Reviewer Comments: <p>Applicant partially satisfies this criterion</p> <p>Applicant discusses its "walk through" data collection process in support of rigorous instruction. Data is used to develop building goals and individualized professional learning plans. Through its Professional Practice Evaluation Committee the district has developed an improved teacher observation tool based on the work of Charlotte Danielson. The district takes justifiable pride in the use of this rubric and reports that as of the date of submitting its RTTD application, 44% of its teachers are Highly Effective. The applicant further notes that the district has a strong need to create student learning environments that emphasize personalization of strategies, tools and other supports for students and teachers. The applicant then references its Performance Measure Charts which are presented in its response to criterion (E). Applicant intends, through its Data Teams, that the district will capture student data and immediately adjust instructional strategies to meet student needs. How this will be done is not elaborated upon except to state that data teams meet weekly for this purpose. The district also has after-school tutoring programs for grades K-5. These initiatives are worthy in and of themselves. But they do not address the fundamental elements of the criterion—or at best only indirectly. The applicant has failed to systematically work through the criterion and subcriteria in order to present the quality plan which is called for. It is noted that the applicant does plan that its RTTD funded professional development is intended to result in the development of personalized learning for students but as has been noted earlier this expectation is hypothetical. In response to criterion (C)(2) there is no discussion of such issues as frequent measuring of student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready graduation requirements or use of data to inform the acceleration of student progress. Other key issues also remain unaddressed. It is noteworthy that the applicant does address improvement of the individual and collective practice of educators and cites the significance of its revamped teacher evaluation system in moving toward this goal. However, as reflected by the discussion above, the applicant fails to make the essential connection between the proposed professional development of its teachers and the realization of a personalized learning environment which addresses, among other critical goals, acceleration of student achievement, deepening of student learning and increased educational equity. The latter lies at the heart of the RTTD initiative. The applicant only partially satisfies criterion (C)(2)</p>		

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	5
(D)(1) Reviewer Comments: <p>Applicant fails to fully satisfy this criterion.</p> <p>Applicant provides the district's organizational chart and asserts that it allows it to engage in a process that facilitates personalized learning. Applicant points out how it engages in curriculum work every summer using the Understanding by Design process. Determining which projects, grade levels and content areas need attention is through the NCLB Instructional</p>		

Management Team needs assessment process. Applicant further notes that Special Education and ESL teachers are always included in this process. It is through the district's professional development training that teachers develop and refine instructional methods that give students the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple ways. The applicant re-emphasizes that its proposed RTTD plan for professional learning will enhance its ability to effectively facilitate personalized learning. Again, this reviewer remains unpersuaded by the applicant's assumptions that this will occur or that gains in student achievement can be correlated with the proposed professional development regardless of how sophisticated the latter may be. The assumptions are speculative and essentially unwarranted without provision of a detailed and professionally credible research design which would allow testing of the underlying but as yet unstated hypotheses. The applicant never provides such information. Applicant does not address the criterion's request for data about the flexibility and autonomy of school leadership teams and the provision of learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable and fully accessible to all students. This criterion is not fully satisfied.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)

10

0

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant does not address this criterion and accordingly fails to satisfy (D)(2).

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	5
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant fails to fully satisfy this criterion.</p> <p>Applicant notes that RTTD funding will allow it to provide 15 days of additional professional development for its teachers each year of the grant. During this time teachers and support staff will engage in an analysis of student achievement on common benchmark assessments aligned to a rigorous curriculum. Instructional strategies, technology tools and instructional materials will be shared in order to foster acceleration of student achievement. Personalized student learning will be developed and monitored for all students. Applicant's concept of personalized learning remains unclear to this reviewer (See responses to prior criteria.) Thus, to this reviewer, applicant's ability to credibly evaluate personalized learning remains questionable. Teacher leaders are to be developed capable of leading professional learning teams. Applicant proposes to monitor its RTTD investment through use of a professional staff evaluation system "as defined by RTTD principles." One is left to wonder what this might be. Student progress will continue to be monitored through the state assessment system and district-determined benchmark assessments aligned to college and career ready standards. Applicant does not elaborate. Applicant does not present a rigorous continuous improvement process that provides for timely and regular feedback on project goals and opportunities for ongoing corrections and improvements as required by the criterion. Nor does applicant define how it will monitor, measure and publicly share information on the quality of its RTTD investments.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant partially satisfies this criterion.</p> <p>Applicant proposes to communicate strategies and processes related to its RTTD proposal within its own organization and with parents and the community. This will occur through outreach meetings, parent meetings and other appropriate venues. The applicant provides no further elaboration on which to base a higher score.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant partially satisfies this criterion.</p>		

Applicant states that performance measures will include state assessments and locally determined benchmarks aligned to college- and career-ready standards. Applicant does not discuss its rationale for choosing its measures or how the measures will provide rigorous, timely and formative information regarding implementation success nor how it will review and improve the measures over time if they are insufficient. Applicant provides multiple charts reflecting performance measures, populations and projections through the life of the grant and satisfies the number of measures required by the criterion. Applicant does not identify the number and percentage of participating students by demographic subgroups whose teacher of record and principal are highly effective.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)

5

0

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant does not satisfy this criterion.

Applicant provides a single paragraph response which fails to address the substance of this criterion. It is obvious to this reviewer that the applicant has given little thought to how it will adequately evaluate the effectiveness of its RTTD investments.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	8

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant satisfies this criterion except for underbudgeted fringe benefits.

Applicant's budget information includes spread sheets describing various expenditures associated with its RTTD proposal. The total amount requested is \$7,419,526.00. This reviewer's inspection of the budget summary indicates that the projections are essentially reasonable and sufficient to support the development and implementation of the applicant's proposal except for fringe benefits which appear to be significantly underbudgeted. It is noted that \$6,526,658 of the budget or 88% is devoted to personnel costs. The reported fringe benefit factor is calculated at .008%. Funds from other sources in support of the applicant's proposal are reported at \$606,452.00. These funds come from several sources documented by the applicant. Applicant reports that the only recurring cost will be for software for students at approximately \$50,000 annually and for teacher/principal evaluation software at approximately \$60,000 annually.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)

10

5

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant satisfies this criterion.

Applicant's RTTD proposal does not envision a need for sustaining the project's goals after the completion of the project. Applicant indicates that with the intensive professional development provided by the funding of this four year project it will have met its goals of creating a strong cadre of teachers and principals. As noted in response to criterion (F)(1), applicant reports that the only recurring cost will be for software for students at approximately \$50,000 annually and for teacher/principal evaluation software at approximately \$60,000 annually. This reviewer remains unpersuaded by the applicant's claim that project goals do not have to be sustained after the termination of the grant period. Professional development—the heart of this proposal—is a continuous responsibility of every school district and should have been addressed in applicant's response to this criterion.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	0
<p>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant fails to meet the requirements of the Competitive Preference Priority:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant fails to provide a sufficient description of a coherent and sustainable partnership as required by this criterion. • Applicant fails to adequately identify population-level desired results for students in the LEA that align with and support the applicant's broader RTTD proposal. While three discrete desired results are stated their relationship to the applicant's RTTD proposal are tenuous at best. • Applicant fails to address CPP(3)(a), CPP(3)(b), CPP(3)(c) and CPP(3)(d). • Applicant fails to address CPP(4). • Applicant fails to address CPP(5)(a), CPP(5)(b), CPP(5)(c), CPP(5)(d), and CPP(5)(e). 		

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Not Met
<p>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant fails to meet the requirements of Absolute Priority 1.</p> <p>Throughout this application there have been multiple cases in which the applicant has failed to respond adequately (i.e., satisfy the criterion) or even to directly address the criterion thus by definition applicant has failed to satisfy Absolute Priority 1. These instances are documented in this reviewer's evaluative comments in response to numerous criteria. Consider these examples:</p> <p>(A)(1) While the vision statement reflects basic commitments to the proposition that all students can learn and that all educators are responsible for making this happen there is no compelling narrative which elaborates the fundamental requirement of this criterion to address acceleration of student achievement, deepening of student learning and increasing equity through personalized instruction.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>(A)(3) The applicant does not speak about a theory of change or logic model. The supposition is that if a comprehensive effort is made to improve professional performance then student achievement will result. This is a major and unsubstantiated premise. This reviewer also remains concerned that the applicant's responses to criterion (A)(3) remain outside the parameters of RTTD intentions with respect to criteria (A)(1) and (A)(2) and thus is not satisfied.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>(A)(4) This reviewer remains unpersuaded by applicant's assumptions that gains in student achievement can be correlated with the proposed professional development regardless of how sophisticated the latter may be. The assumptions are speculative and essentially unwarranted without provision of a detailed and professionally credible research design. The applicant does not provide such information. The applicant has failed to satisfy this criterion.</p> <p>OR</p>		

(C)(1) This criterion is complex, demanding and explicit in terms of the responses expected by the applicant. Instead, the responses which are provided are superficial. They generally contain essentially extraneous information rather than being directly responsive to the criterion. Generalized statements are made about district commitments, innovative programs, authentic learning units or technology infused classroom experiences but the applicant never gets close to a pursuit of learning and developmental goals linked to college- and career-ready standards or fostering deep learning experiences, access to diverse cultures or the 21st century learning skills that are identified in the criterion.

OR

(C)(2) The applicant fails to make the essential connection between the proposed professional development of its teachers and the realization of a personalized learning environment which addresses, among other critical goals, acceleration of student achievement, deepening of student learning and increased educational equity. The latter lies at the heart of the RTTD notice. The applicant only partially satisfies this criterion.

Other evidence can be provided but these citations are sufficient to confirm this reviewer's judgment that the applicant has failed to satisfy Absolute Priority 1.

Total	210	72
-------	-----	----